

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be a full and complete response to the Office Action mailed September 2, 2010. Claims 13 to 24 are pending in the present application. Claims 13, 16, and 17 have been amended in this response.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112:

Claim 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 17 has been amended, thereby bringing them into accord with the written description.

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 17 has been amended to remedy this issue.

Claims 13 - 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 13 has been amended to remedy this issue.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

The Examiner rejects Claims 13 to 15, 17 to 18, 20 to 22, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr '384 in view of Pham et al. '440 and Krueger '062. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner notes that Carr '384 discloses a process for substantially removing the metal carbonyl content of a gas stream, but fails to disclose the step of treating the gas stream (after the removal of the metal carbonyl) to remove oxygen and hydrocarbon. The Examiner then introduces Pham et al. '440 and Krueger '062 to cure these deficiencies.

Carr '384 expressly identifies copper catalysts as being "hydrogenation catalysts" which "can convert some of the syngas to methane and alcohols. This of course is undesirable." (column 2, lines 54 – 60). Hence, Carr '384 expressly teaches away from claim 13 of the instant application, as currently amended, and Pham et al. '440 and Krueger '062 can not cure this deficiency. Thus the rejection is improper and should be vacated.

The Examiner rejects Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr '384 in view of Pham et al. '440 and Krueger '062, and further in view of Heyd '361 and Britton et al. '928. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Carr '384 teaches away from claim 13 of the present invention. Claim 16 is dependent up claim 13, and none of these references cures this deficiency.. Hence the rejection is improper and should be vacated.

The Examiner rejects Claim 18 – 19, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr '384 in view of Pham et al. '440 and Krueger '062, and further in view of Bancon et al' 989 and Engelbrecht et al. '100. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Carr '384 teaches away from claim 13 of the present invention. Claims 18 – 19, and 23 are dependent up claim 13, and none of these references cures this deficiency. Hence the rejection is improper and should be vacated.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants maintain that Claims 13 to 24 are now in condition for allowance. Early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe a telephone call would expedite the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Applicants do not believe that any fee is due at this time. However, in the event that any additional fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to debit deposit account number 01-1375 for the amount due. Also, the Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment with regard to the present response to deposit account number 01-1375.

Respectfully submitted,

/Elwood Leonard Haynes/
Elwood Leonard Haynes
Registration No. 55,254

Date: November 30, 2010

Air Liquide US, LLC
2700 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1800
Houston, Texas 77056
Phone: (713)624-8952
Fax: (713) 624-8950